

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/641,350	SHAW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shane Bomar	3672	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Shane Bomar.

(3) _____

(2) Chandran Kumar.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 February 2007

Time: 10:45 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

36 and 40

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I contacted Attorney Kumar because there appeared to be some typographical errors in the amendments to claims 36 and 40. It was agreed, via an Examiner's amendment, to add --with a subsea pump-- after chemical in line 6 of claim 36 and to remove "flowing" and "using a subsea pump" in the same line. It was further agreed to remove the first limitation of claim 40 leaving only one limitation in the claim, wherein the word "conveying" will also be removed.